



Shirley S. Abrahamson
Chief Justice

Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Telephone (608) 266-1880

TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880

Fax (608) 267-0640

Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

December 2013

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of December 2013 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2013.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 10 cases in December. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>December 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>10</u>	<u>19</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	8	14
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	2	4
Criminal cases	0	1

Petitions for Review

A total of 56 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In December, the Supreme Court disposed of 82 petitions for review, of which 15 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 260 petitions for review pending.

	<u>December 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>56</u>	<u>258</u>
Civil cases	30	135
Criminal cases	26	123

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>82</u>	<u>359</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	42 (5)	187 (18)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	40 (10)	172 (18)

Petitions for Bypass

In December, the Supreme Court received 1 petition for bypass and disposed of 0 petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has 1 petition for bypass pending.

	<u>December 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed.....	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Civil cases	0	1
Criminal cases	1	2
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	3 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	2 (0)

Requests for Certification

During December 2013, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of no requests for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has no requests for certification pending.

	<u>December 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases	0	1
Criminal cases	0	1
Request for Certification dispositions.....	0	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (3)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 8 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 0 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 11 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original actions were filed. An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in “Opinions Issued by the Court” above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. The Supreme Court currently has 35 regulatory matters and 24 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

December 2013 Term to Date

Filings

Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	8	21
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	11	25
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	0

Dispositions by Order

Attorney discipline.....	0	0
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	5	23
Other (including Original Actions).....	2	3

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING December 2013

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2012AP2321-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Sean D. Cooper License Revoked Per Curiam ¹	12/10/2013
2011AP2946-D	OLR v. Suzanne M. Smith License Suspension Per Curiam	12/12/2013
2012AP2727-D	OLR v. James P. Grenisen License Suspension Per Curiam	12/13/2013
2012AP740-D	OLR v. Vladimir M. Gorokhovsky License Suspension Per Curiam	12/17/2013
2011AP1820-D	OLR v. John Miller Carroll License Suspension Per Curiam	12/19/2013
2013AP1720-D	OLR v. Yuri Bernard Nielsen License Revoked Per Curiam	12/20/2013
2011AP1767-D	OLR v. Bridget E. Boyle License Suspension Per Curiam	12/26/2013
2013AP1685-D	OLR v. Perry H. Friesler License Revoked Per Curiam	12/26/2013

¹ “Per Curiam” means “by the Court.” Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2011AP2608	Michael D. Phillips v. Daniel G. Parmelee Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. Prosser, J. did not participate.	12/27/2013
2012AP001426	State v. Brandon H. Bentdahl Court of Appeals decision modified and affirmed, and, as modified, cause remanded to circuit court. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Crooks, J.	12/27/2013